arXiv:1412.3368v1 [cond-mat.mes-hall] 10 Dec 2014

Can Dirac fluid in graphene be made more perfect?

Sergei Sergeenkov
Departamento de Física, CCEN, Universidade Federal da Paraíba, 58051-970 João Pessoa, PB, Brazil
(Dated: December 11, 2014)

To answer this question, we discuss the properties of electronic viscosity in deformed graphene by introducing strain ϵ and velocity gradient ∇v as pseudo-magnetic $B^d \propto \hbar\epsilon$ and pseudo-electric $E^d \propto \hbar\nabla v$ fields into the Dirac model. We found that kinematic viscosity ν depends on applied strain as $\nu \propto \epsilon^{-3/2}$, decreasing from $\nu \simeq 0.005m^2/s$ at $\epsilon = 0.05$ to $\nu \simeq 10^{-4}m^2/s$ at $\epsilon = 0.5$, and simultaneously leading to a rather significant increase of the Reynolds number $Re \propto 1/\nu$ from $Re(\epsilon = 0.05) \simeq 20$ to $Re(\epsilon = 0.5) \simeq 1000$ which opens a real possibility for manifestation of noticeable turbulent effects in strained graphene.

PACS numbers: 72.80.Vp, 47.75.+f

Still full of surprises, graphene continues to attract attention as a unique test ground for many interesting ideas from condensed matter physics, quantum field theory and gravity (see, e.g. [1–8] and further references therein). In particular, its electronic properties are shown to closely follow predictions of the relativistic hydrodynamics with extremely small value of Dirac fluid viscosity [9–11]. This phenomenon, coined "an almost perfect electronic fluid", has been attributed to manifestation of specific topological properties of graphene. At the same time, many interesting and unusual phenomena in graphene under mechanical deformations (leading to substantial modifications of its electronic structure) have been recently observed or predicted [12–21].

In this Letter we discuss the properties of dynamic viscosity of electronic fluid in a strained graphene by introducing a homogeneous strain and constant velocity gradient into the Dirac model via pseudomagnetic and pseudoelectric field, respectively. The obtained analytical results suggest quite an optimistic possibility for further improvement of the perfectness of the Dirac fluid in a strained graphene along with a concomitant strain-induced change of electronic fluid motion from a laminar to a turbulent behavior.

Recall [12, 13, 17] that in the absence of chirality (intervalley) mixing, the low-energy electronic properties of graphene near the Fermi surface can be reasonably described by a two-component wave function $|\Psi>=(\Psi_A,\Psi_B)$ obeying a massless Dirac equation

$$\mathcal{H}|\Psi>=E|\Psi> \tag{1}$$

with an effective Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}=v_F(\sigma_x\pi_x+\sigma_y\pi_y)+eV_d \tag{2}$$

Here, $\pi_a=p_a+eA_a^d$ with $p_a=-i\hbar\nabla_a$ being the momentum operator and $A_a^d=(0,A_y^d)$ the deformation induced vector potential, eV_d is a chemical potential; σ_a are the Pauli matrices, and v_F is the Fermi velocity. In what follows, $a=\{x,y\}$. Let us consider viscosity of an electronic fluid η driven by a constant velocity gradient ∇v in a square $(L\times L)$ graphene sheet under the influence of a homogeneous strain field ϵ. As is well known [12, 13], the homogeneous strain ϵ induced gauge potential is given by $A_y^d=B_z^d x$ where $B_z^d=\hbar\epsilon/er^2$ is a pseudo-magnetic field inside deformed graphene with $r=0.14nm$ being carbon-carbon bond length. By analogy with plastically deformed graphene [17], we introduce viscosity effects into the model through a constant velocity gradient $\nabla_y v$ induced scalar potential $V_d=E_y^d y$ where $E_y^d=\hbar\nabla_y v/er$ is a pseudo-electric field created by a moving electronic fluid. Without losing generality, in what follows we assume that the velocity v is a scalar and use $\nabla_y v\equiv\nabla v$ to simplify notations.

It can be easily verified that Dirac equation (1) with the above-defined potentials have the normalized solutions

$$\Psi_A=C_1\exp\left[i(k_1x+k_2y)-\frac{(x-x_0)^2}{2l_1^2}-\frac{(y+y_0)^2}{2l_2^2}\right] \tag{3}$$

and

$$\Psi_B=C_2\left[i\frac{(x-x_0)}{l_1^2}+\frac{(y+y_0)}{l_2^2}\right]\Psi_A \tag{4}$$

with $k_1=x_0/l_1^2$, $k_2=y_0/l_2^2$, and the total energy

$$E=\hbar v_F\sqrt{\frac{2}{l_1^2}+\frac{2}{l_2^2}} \tag{5}$$

where $l_1^2=\hbar/eB_z^d$ and $l_2^2=\hbar v_F/eE_y^d$.

Recall that a linear (that is ∇v independent) coefficient of dynamic shear viscosity η is defined via stress field σ created by a gradient of velocity v as

$$\sigma=\eta\nabla v \tag{6}$$

On the other hand, the stress field can be generally defined as a strain ϵ induced response of the electronic fluid (within a graphene sheet of area $A=L\times L$), namely

$$\sigma\equiv-\frac{1}{A}\left[\frac{\partial E}{\partial\epsilon}\right] \tag{7}$$

As a result, from Eqs.(5)-(7), one obtains

$$\eta \equiv \left[\frac{\partial\sigma}{\partial\nabla v}\right]_{\nabla v=0} = \left(\frac{\hbar}{L^2}\right)\left(\frac{1}{2\epsilon}\right)^{3/2} \quad (8)$$

for the coefficient of shear viscosity in strained graphene. First of all, notice that since $\eta \propto \epsilon^{-3/2}$, the increase of an applied stress field ϵ results in decreasing of the linear viscosity coefficient. More specifically, in order to compare the predicted here effects with the available data based on a hydrodynamic approach [9–11], let us introduce the so-called kinematic viscosity ν which is related to the shear coefficient via the mass density ρ of the fluid as follows, $\nu = \eta/\rho$. According to [11], at room temperature the mass density of electronic fluid in graphene is of the order of $\rho \simeq 6 \times 10^{-19} kg/m^2$ leading to $\nu \simeq 0.005 m^2/s$. It can be easily verified that in our case of strain induced viscosity, this value of ν corresponds to typical values of $\epsilon = 0.05$ and $L = 1\mu m$. At the same time, according to our predictions, application of an experimentally achievable strain [22] of $\epsilon = 0.5$ will result in a drop of kinematic viscosity to $\nu \simeq 10^{-4} m^2/s$. Recall that within the hydrodynamic approach [11], the electron conductivity σ is related to ν as $\sigma \propto 1/\nu$ leading to strain-induced increase of conductivity $\sigma(\epsilon) \propto \epsilon^{3/2}$ with the ratio $\sigma(\epsilon = 0.5)/\sigma(\epsilon = 0.05) \simeq 50$. It is worthwhile to mention that in graphene electron fluid velocities can reach as high as [23] $v \simeq 0.1 v_F$ leading to gradients $\nabla v \simeq v/L \simeq 0.1 v_F/L \simeq 10^{11} s^{-1}$ for $L = 1\mu m$. On the other hand, in addition to a rather strong decrease of the viscosity, Eq.(8) predicts a real possibility for manifestation of turbulent like regime in graphene which is characterized by large enough values of the Reynolds number $Re = vL/\nu$. Indeed, according to Eq.(8), one obtains

$$Re = \frac{\rho v L}{\eta} = \frac{\rho v L^3 (2\epsilon)^{3/2}}{\hbar} \quad (9)$$

for strain dependent Reynolds number. Given the abovementioned estimates of the model parameters (namely [9–11, 23], $\rho = 6 \times 10^{-19} kg/m^2$, $v = 0.1 v_F$ and $L = 1\mu m$), Eq.(9) predicts quite a significant increase of the Reynolds number from $Re \simeq 20$ (at $\epsilon = 0.05$) to $Re \simeq 1000$ (at $\epsilon = 0.5$), describing a strain-induced laminar-to-turbulent transition of electronic fluid in graphene which could be relevant for potential nanoelectronics applications [9, 24].

This work has been financially supported by the Brazilian agency CAPES.

[1] A.K. Geim and A.H. MacDonald, Phys. Today **60**, 35 (2007).
[2] A.K. Geim, Science **324**, 1530 (2009).
[3] K.S. Novoselov, Rev. Mod. Phys. **83**, 837 (2011).
[4] E. Shuryak, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **53**, 273 (2004).
[5] P.K. Kovtun, D.T. Son, and A.O. Starinets, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 111601 (2005).
[6] M.I. Katsnelson and G.E. Volovik, JETP Lett. **95**, 411 (2012).
[7] M.I. Katsnelson and G.E. Volovik, J. Low Temp. Phys. **175**, 655 (2014).
[8] G.E. Volovik M.A. Zubkov, Ann. Phys. (NY) **340**, 352 (2014).
[9] M. Muller, J. Schmalian, and L. Fritz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 025301 (2009).
[10] M. Mendoza, B.M. Boghosian, H.J. Herrmann, and S. Succi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 014502 (2010).
[11] M.Mendoza, H.J. Herrmann, and S. Succi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 156601 (2011).
[12] M.A.H. Vozmediano, M.I. Katsnelson, and F. Guinea, Phys. Rep. **496**, 109 (2010).
[13] Ken-ichi Sasaki, Riichiro Saito, M.S. Dresselhaus, Katsunori Wakabayashi, and Toshiaki Enok, New Journal of Phys. **12**, 103015 (2010).
[14] N. Levy, S.A. Burke, K.L. Meaker, M. Panlasigui, A. Zettl, F. Guinea, A. H. Castro Neto, and M. F. Crommie, Science **329**, 544 (2010).
[15] S. Sergeenkov and F.M. Araujo-Moreira, Solid State Commun. **158**, 58 (2013).
[16] S. Sergeenkov and F.M. Araujo-Moreira, Phys. Lett. A **377**, 3158 (2013).
[17] S. Sergeenkov and F.M. Araujo-Moreira, JETP Lett. **98**, 88 (2013).
[18] Jamie H. Warner, Elena Roxana Margine, Masaki Mukai, Alexander W. Robertson, Feliciano Giustino, and Angus I. Kirkland, Science **337**, 209 (2012).
[19] Tony Low and F. Guinea, Nano Letters **10**, 3551 (2010).
[20] Yongjin Jiang, Tony Low, Kai Chang, Mikhail I. Katsnelson, and Francisco Guinea, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 046601 (2013).
[21] Jiong Lu, Yang Bao, Chen Liang Su, and Kian Ping Loh, ACS Nano **7**, 8350 (2013).
[22] Mark A. Bissett, Masaharu Tsuji, and Hiroki Ago, Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. **16**, 11124 (2014).
[23] Inanc Meric, Melinda Y. Han, Andrea F. Young, Barbaros Ozyilmaz, Philip Kim, and Kenneth L. Shepard, Nature Nanotechnology **3**, 654 (2008).
[24] A.K. Saha, K. Muralidhar, and G. Biswas, Journal of Engineering Mechanics-ASCE **126**, 523 (2000).